

had for subjects making sense of and navigating the constraints imposed by Roman monarchy and, at the same time, the real possibilities of local government, while putting faith in legal proceedings (148–53). This is a particularly interesting spin on Mary Beard's earlier questions about how to understand Roman declamation's preoccupations ('Looking (Harder) for Roman Myth', in F. Graf (ed.), *Mythos in mythenloser Gesellschaft. Das Paradigma Roms* (1993), 44–64). When L. thinks big like this, one can imagine *That Tyrant, Persuasion* in productive conversation with, for example, studies of modes of organisation and categorisation peculiar to the Roman imperial world, such as the configuration of space or the arrangement of lists. There is much to inspire future work here.

Harvard University
dench@fas.harvard.edu

EMMA DENCH

doi:10.1017/S007543582400042X

© The Author(s), 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

CHRISTOPH F. KONRAD, *THE CHALLENGE TO THE AUSPICES: STUDIES ON MAGISTERIAL POWER IN THE MIDDLE ROMAN REPUBLIC*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2022. Pp. xx + 342, map. ISBN 9780192855527. £90.00.

This timely monograph explores the actions of Roman magistrates in the fourth and third centuries B.C.E. in relation to the fundamental concept of the auspices, which granted divine approval or disapproval for public action. As the title suggests, Christoph Konrad focuses on examples of commanders challenging the role of the auspices in Roman society, proposing that these are not isolated incidents, as usually interpreted, but 'expressions of a larger sense of dissatisfaction among elements of the Roman political class' (ix). The book is filled with stimulating analysis of thorny historical problems, and offers new insights on the tenets of Roman magisterial power — *imperium* and *auspicium* — and the constitutional positions of the dictator and *magister equitum*. It speaks to recent scholarship on augury and religious belief (Driediger-Murphy, *Roman Republican Augury* (2019); Champion, *The Peace of the Gods* (2017)) as much as it does to literature on complex constitutional questions (Drogula, *Commanders and Command* (2015); Vervaeke, *The High Command* (2014)) and Roman magistracies (although, notably, Wilson's *Dictator* (2021) is incorporated in a limited way due to its recent publication). The focal point of the work is an attempt to explain the Fasti Capitolini entry for Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucossus' dictatorship in 217.

After starting from the conflict between the dictator, L. Papirius Cursor, and his *magister equitum*, Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus, in 324 (ch. 1), chs 2–4 outline the concepts of *imperium* and *auspicium* as they applied to the offices of dictator and *magister equitum*. K. persuasively argues that the initial 'auspices of investiture' covered both military and civil action. From close analysis of the Greek sources, K. concludes that the dictator derived his superiority from the inability of the regular magistrates to exercise their powers without his instruction. As K. rightly observes, the powers of the *magister equitum* were conferred via appointment by the dictator, and the pair held linked auspices — vitiation implicated them both. However, for his overall argument, K. asserts that the consulship could not be held simultaneously with the office of *magister equitum*. K. does not explain how this aligns with the naming of the *magister equitum* — the dictator's first action — that immediately bestowed the magisterial powers of *imperium* and *auspicium* (115–16, 134).

In ch. 5, K. develops his position that there was an underlying challenge to the auspices across this period through analysis of three third-century incidents involving consuls who ignored or tried to subvert the signs, including P. Claudius Pulcher drowning the sacred chickens in 249.

At ch. 6, we reach the main puzzle that K. seeks to solve: why Fabius was appointed dictator *interregni causa*, according to the Fasti Capitolini. K. argues that this notice belongs to Fabius' first dictatorship, which he places in 223: the consuls C. Flaminius and P. Furius Philus were declared vitiated, but Flaminius refused to abdicate. K. suggests that by naming Flaminius as his *magister equitum*, Fabius compelled Flaminius to resign, while offering a solution that left his *dignitas* intact. In turn, the squeak of a mouse at the moment of the appointment betrayed the

flawed auspices of both Flaminius and Fabius, who — under this reasoning — must have been appointed by the other vitiated consul (and augur), Furius, also forcing their abdication. This brought about the desired outcome of an interregnum. While K. constructs a neat resolution to this specific historical problem, and definitively rules out augural manipulation led by Fabius, there are a number of assumptions that must be accepted. First, that Fabius' first dictatorship fell in 223 and not 221–219, as usually accepted; second, that the *Fasti Capitolini* omits Fabius' first dictatorship entirely and reassigns this entry to his second dictatorship in 217; third, that to become *magister equitum*, Flaminius had first to resign as consul. K. provides welcome analysis on the order of events (following Zonar., 8.20), but offers nothing on the inconsistency between Furius' lack of action on campaign and his (conjectured) willingness to appoint Fabius dictator under flawed auspices.

Ch. 7 continues the theme of Flaminius' contempt for the auspices leading up to his disastrous campaign at Lake Trasimene in 217, which, for K., decisively demonstrated the relevance of the auspices to the political class at Rome. In ch. 8, K. suggests that these five occasions of commanders disregarding the auspices between 249 and 217 hint at a minority view within the nobility. K. concludes that, based on the outcomes of their actions, it was no longer defensible to challenge the auspices by the early second century.

As K. does not attempt to provide a 'straightforward monograph', but a 'collection of related studies' (ix), the structure of the argument is at times difficult to follow. Since chs 2–4 lay the technical foundations for the case studies in chs 5–8, each study cannot easily be read alone. The lack of introductory and summary sections throughout the work and the inconsistent translation of quoted ancient sources make this less accessible to a wider audience — the abstracts available in the digital version offset this somewhat. However, this reader would have enjoyed broad engagement with the (expansive) bibliography outside specific argumentation, especially recent studies on the auspices (Driediger-Murphy (2019); Berthelet, *Gouverner avec les dieux* (2015)). The work is well produced, with detailed indices.

K. provides innovative and thorough analysis of the auspices and how the Roman nobility interacted with them, making this monograph essential reading for those interested in religion and politics in republican Rome.

University of Oxford
kimberley.webb@classics.ox.ac.uk

KIMBERLEY WEBB

doi:10.1017/S0075435823001016

© The Author(s), 2024. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Society for the Promotion of Roman Studies.

CLARA BENNENDONNER, *LE PEUPLE ET L'ARGENT; ADMINISTRATION ET REPRÉSENTATIONS DU TRÉSOR PUBLIC DANS LA ROME RÉPUBLICAINE (509–49 AV. J.-C.)*. (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 404). Rome: École française de Rome, 2022. Pp. 578. ISBN 9782728315598. €35.00.

Before exploring Berrendonner's examination of the Roman republican treasury, I note that it is one of the Publications de l'École française de Rome, with its wonderful practice of releasing open-source research via books.openedition.org. The hard copy is not overly expensive, but making a monograph — especially one that aims to be an authoritative reference work — available without charge globally is a service to the field that must be acknowledged as such.

And B.'s work will rightly be a standard one for those interested in the Roman republican 'state' (a term rejected at 42 and 356), finance and politics. It comprises an introduction, four chapters and nearly 100 pages of tables recording references for booty and public building, the text of *Lex Cornelia de XX Quaestoribus*, the *Lex Repetundarum*, the RRC details for all quaestorian coins, and a long table of attested financial activity by magistrates. The data in these appendices reflect B.'s grounded, positivist approach; she reconstructs what the Roman treasury — and Roman public finance in some broader sense — was and how it worked.

B. excavates centuries of scholarship to erect a target for demolition (esp. 31–4). According to this old view, an inability to distinguish the concepts of public and private crippled the development of